

Equal Rights

VOL. XVIII, No. 35
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY
OCTOBER 1, 1932



Courtesy International News.

Amelia Earhart at the White House

This picture was taken after the Equal Rights Conference which Miss Earhart had with the President. She was accompanied by Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, National Chairman, National Woman's Party, and Anita Pollitzer, Vice-Chairman.

Equal Rights



OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D. C.
Phone, Lincoln 1366
Published Weekly
at 19 West Chase Street,
Baltimore, Md.
Phone, Vernon 3279

Edith Houghton Hooker Editor
Ruby A. Black Managing Editor
Dora G. Ogle Business Manager

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Nina E. Allender	Ada Davenport Kendall
Zoe Beckley	Alma Lutz
Elaine Sterne Carrington	Hazel MacKaye
Lucia Chamberlain	Edna St. Vincent Millay
Phyllis Duganne	Ruth Pickering
Ernestine Evans	Allice Robe
Rose Feld	Maryse Rutledge
Zona Gale	Miriam Finn Scott
Helen Davenport Gibbons	Doris Stevens
Rebecca Hourwich	Sophie Treadwell
Ruth Hale	Brenda Ueland
Inez Haynes Irwin	Mary Winsor

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice,
Baltimore, Md., Under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, \$2.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, \$2.50

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

President, Mrs. Oliver H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Chairman National Council, Mrs. Harvey Wiley, D. C.
Vice-Chairmen,
Gail Laughlin, Me.
Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Secretary, Mrs. Dwight Clark, D. C.
Treasurer, Laura Berrien, D. C.
Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.
Director of National Activities, Muna Lee.
Parliamentarian, Emma Fox, Mich.
Edith Alinge, N. Y.
Nina E. Allender, D. C.
Mrs. John W. Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Merritt O. Chance, D. C.
Mrs. Isaac H. Dixon, Md.
Bertha W. Fowler, Colo.
Elsie Hill, Conn.
Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.
Ruth Vander Litt, N. Y.
Alma Lutz, N. Dak.
Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.
Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Alice Paul, N. J.
Sarah Pell, N. Y.
Elizabeth Selken Rogers, N. Y.
Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
A. Marguerite Smith, Mass.
Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mrs. John Jay White, N. Y.
Margaret Whittemore, Calif.
Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio
Maud Younger, Calif.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues	\$10.00
Associate Members	\$1.00
Subscribing Members	\$3.00
Founders	\$100.00
Life Members	\$1,000.00
Endowers	\$5,000.00
Sustainers	\$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

The object of this organization shall be to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 52]
[House Joint Resolution Number 55]
Introduced in the Senate June 4, 1929,
by SENATOR GERALD P. NYE, North Dakota.

Introduced in the House January 11, 1932,
by REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS LUDLOW,
Indiana.

Amelia Earhart

A GREAT person is always a great person.

The same directness and decision which took Amelia Earhart across the Atlantic came into action in her instant comprehension that the most effective and efficient way of dealing with the status of women in the United States is by an amendment to the Constitution.

It is natural that Miss Earhart's approach to everything should show the same directness and appreciation of the short cut. Therefore when the group from the National Woman's Party was granted an interview with President Hoover, Amelia Earhart came to Washington to put into words her conviction.

No official with humanity as well as power could be otherwise than impressed by the sight of a woman of high achievement coming before him to plead for the speedy passage of the Lucretia Mott Amendment, in order that other women might enjoy the freedom of opportunity in their professions which she had known in climbing to success in aviation.

When Miss Earhart told the President that even in her varied experience she had been hampered by discriminations against her as a woman, it must have been evident to a thinking person that the discriminations against the less powerful and the less articulate women must be even greater. Miss Earhart's instinctive reaction against injustice must have made an impression upon the President, whose confidence in her judgment and ability and admiration for her courageous achievement has been so heartily expressed.

Also Miss Earhart is now engaged in a profession where the law recognizes no discriminations on the grounds of sex. She would not be the splendid character that she is, were she indifferent to the unjust situations confronting women who find their own desires of honest achievement in many fields blocked by unjust law.

There are individual women in the world who can achieve their goal in spite of discriminations in law and custom. Rare is such an individual who can realize that where she had the strength to overcome regardless of handicaps upon her sex, the mass of womankind has not. Women of this country should be proud and grateful to this great woman.

The Woman's Party and the Candidates

IT IS evident that the subject of equality between men and women has changed radically since the campaign of 1928 from a somewhat academic question to one of acute and vital importance.

Two great events or series of events have brought to women of the entire world the blinding realization that the unequal status of men and women has become a devastating reality instead of merely a menace which has been talked about.

The world economic depression has shown women with startling clearness that in times of stress, poverty and starvation, the privations are faced by women first. Throughout the world of industry women have been called upon to contribute their very livelihood to the demands of men. The right to work is being decided by men as the sole right of men. Every working woman today has seen with stunning clarity the terrible truth, and never can she forget it.

The Nationality Convention now before the nations for action is the second case in point. Again women have found that they are still a subject class, and that American women are in danger of being placed internationally with those of lowest civilization. It is imperative that the code of law to be administered by the World Court recognize in no unmistakable manner the absolute equality of men and women.

It is with this clear idea of the dangers confronting them that the women of the National Woman's Party have called on the candidates of the major political parties to acquaint them with the situation. They have been told of the great discriminations which exist for a great part of the electorate, discriminations which have become galling realities in this time of distress amongst nations. These candidates are now fully and equally informed. The National Woman's Party is non-partisan and contains within its ranks women of all parties. The pronouncements of the candidates will be most carefully studied and it is earnestly to be hoped that the men who so seriously and attentively listened to the presentations made in the weeks just passed, will show themselves as alive to justice equally in law and opportunity, to every voter in the country, man and woman.

The President Receives an Equal Rights Deputation

PRESIDENT HOOVER, on Thursday, September 22, talked with a deputation from the National Woman's Party for twenty-five minutes, although fifteen minutes had been allotted for the interview.

Amelia Earhart, who made her deep interest in the cause of women so evident at the time of her ocean flight, came from New York to express to the President as a member of this deputation, her hope that the equality which women now enjoy in the field of aviation be extended to women in all fields. She expressed the hope that the President would use his influence to hasten the passage of the Lucretia Mott Amendment granting Equal Rights to men and women.

The deputation, consisting of Miss Earhart, Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, Chairman National Woman's Party; Anita Pollitzer, Vice-Chairman; Burnita Shelton Matthews, Chairman Legal Research Department, National Woman's Party; and Ruth Taunton of California, called on the President to acquaint him with the situation in which American women find themselves today, discriminated against in the law and denied equal opportunity in industry.

The President received the group in his private office, and invited them to be seated.

Mrs. Wiley opened the conference, saying: "Mr. President, we have come today to discuss with you the most important issue with women, namely, their equal opportunity with men before the law.

"We have come to confer with you, Mr. President, not expecting a definite answer today, but to talk things over. We feel that members of the Woman's Party are specialists in the field of women's endeavor, and knowing your stand on equality of opportunity we hope you will see the way to help realize this result.

"Women everywhere are appealing to the Woman's Party for help in this crisis. We trust, Mr. President, that in making clear to other classes of citizens, in your speeches, that their interests are to be safeguarded, that you will make clear to women also that you believe in a square deal for them.

"Women of this country have been lifted from their lethargy by the achievement of Amelia Earhart and by the spirited stand she has consistently taken for equal recognition for women in her own field of endeavor. She brings you today the subject closest to the hearts of thousands of women in the United States—a message of Equal Rights for women with men under the law and in all fields of endeavor.

"Miss Earhart, who needs no introduction, will now speak."

In the straightforward and earnest manner which has won for her the admiration of the world, Amelia Earhart said: "Mr. President, I know from practical experience of the discriminations which confront women when they enter an occupation where men have priority in opportunity, advancement and promotion.

"In aviation, the Department of Commerce recognizes no legal difference between men and women licensed to fly. I feel that similar equality should be carried into all fields of endeavor so that men and women may achieve, without handicap because of sex.

"As far as our own country is concerned, in every State of the Union today, there are discriminations against women in the law.

"I join with the National Woman's Party in hoping for the speedy passage of the Lucretia Mott Amendment which would write into the highest law of our land that 'Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.' Your own statements on equality of opportunity make me believe you understand our desire."

Mrs. Wiley then introduced Anita Pollitzer, Vice-Chairman of the National Woman's Party, who said:

"Mr. President, our colleague has just told you that even in a new field it is not quite as easy for a woman as for a man to have the same opportunity to achieve. Think how much harder it is when women have to contend with age-old traditions of the law—the English Common Law, the Spanish law, the Napoleonic Code—all rooted in discriminations bearing no relation to modern life.

"In your speech of acceptance you said we must 'preserve equality of opportunity to every individual so that he may achieve for himself the best to which his character, ability and ambition entitles him.' We have come to you today because we wish to present to you facts on the discriminations which exist against women, and which are a handicap to them in achieving. There is not a single State in the Union today where all the laws apply equally to men and women.

"In almost one-half of the States women are limited in their power to contract, or to carry on a business. In more than one-third of the States mothers do not have Equal Rights with fathers in regard to their children. In some States inheritance laws discriminate against women, in others the earnings and services of married women are given to their husbands.

"In two-thirds of the States the law sanctions a double standard of morals. In twenty-seven States women cannot serve as jurors and in some they are barred from public offices. Women are discriminated against under citizenship, immigration and naturalization laws. And most important economically, as has been emphasized during this period of depression, so-called 'protection' laws have been passed restricting the labor of women but not of men. These discriminatory laws based on the sex of the worker rather than the nature of the work handicap wage-earning women and prevent them from earning their livelihood on equal terms with men.

"No man with pride or spirit would tolerate such injustice against himself. Such widespread, nation-wide injustice is worthy of your attention.

"Our issue must be fought on the international as well as on the national front. You, Mr. President, as one who dares to take the lead in international affairs, we beg of you to consider the anxiety with which women regard the possibility of our country's committing itself to a world organization which would impose upon us the old attitude of the subjection of women. For example, should the United States decide to enter the World Court, it is imperative that it safeguard us against a code of law to be administered by that court which would deal in one way with women and another with men. I speak at this moment of the Nationality Convention now before the nations of the world for action."

The question of the opposition to Equal Rights was discussed and it was pointed out that opposition came from two sources only—certain labor leaders, and certain welfare workers who want greater protection for women than for men.

"Questions that deal with human freedom are second to none. The National Woman's Party is working for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution which declares, 'Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction.' Just as the suffrage amendment granted nation-wide suffrage and wrote the principle of equal suffrage in the highest law of the land, so the Equal Rights amendment will write the principle of equality in the United States Constitution, the place for fundamental principles. There is no permanency in State laws. A constitutional amendment would prevent new discriminations against women from being made in the future, and although a mandate to the States to equalize their laws as between men and women, would leave each State

free to decide which way it prefers to equalize them.

"The women of the country are awaiting a pronouncement from you, Mr. President, on equal opportunity for men and women—in all fields of endeavor, and

Equal Rights under the law. We have brought to you this information in support of equality."

Mrs. Wiley then said that Mrs. Matthews had prepared a statement setting forth existing discriminations, with ref-

erences listing the States in which these discriminations occur and covering the citations. This was presented to the President. Throughout the interview the President showed his interest by repeated questions.

Urges Repeal of "Married Persons" Clause

JESSIE DELL, Civil Service Commissioner, spoke at a tea Sunday afternoon, September 25, at Alva Belmont House. The affair was under the auspices of the Government Workers' Council of the National Woman's Party.

In the course of her address Miss Dell said: "Section 213 of the so-called Economy Act, approved June 30, 1932, provides that in any reduction of personnel in any branch of the Government service married persons (living with husband or wife) employed in the class to be reduced shall be dismissed before any other persons employed in such class, if such husband or wife is also in the service of the United States or the District of Columbia. The section further provides that in making appointment to the classified civil service preference shall be given to persons other than married persons whose husband or wife is already in the service.

"Just what economy is served or in just what way efficiency of operation of Government business is advanced by such a law has never been explained. Ostensibly, the object of the statute is the distribution of jobs, but this distribution could probably have been brought about just as effectively by providing, for example, that a father or son should be dismissed in case both were employed. There are any number of family relationships that could have been injected into the matter, which would have been just as effective as a penalty on marriage.

"The reason, I think, for the provision being written into the law was to strike at the employment of women generally. At the eleventh hour the law was changed so as to include married men as well as married women, but this inclusion of the men was brought about because of the

fear on the part of the legislators of the political effect it would have if the discrimination were so clearly and forcibly shown to be against women only.

"For some time I had deluded myself into believing that women's ability and demonstrated worth were slowly but surely placing them into the positions to which they were justly entitled and forcing recognition on the part of officials and public alike that they should be accorded the same privileges and rights accorded to men. It is rather difficult for me to get over the fact that, after the remarkable work which women have done, men still cannot put aside their biased opinions and honestly consider the real good of the service. This strange freak of legislation is merely a reaction of this unreasonable attitude towards the employment of women.

"There have been efforts on the part of married persons to evade the law by voluntary separation or divorce. Such efforts could easily have been foreseen but, nevertheless, the law was passed, and an incentive furnished to increase the divorce rate and further endanger the home institution. The Civil Service Commission must, of course, observe the law as long as it is a law.

"It is my belief that all this agitation about married women is merely an excuse to strike at the equality of women with men generally. The labor laws are said to be for the protection of women in industry but, from my viewpoint, they do not protect; they lower the standard of women in employment. Women are not crying for protection; they demand equality. A genuine protection would be the recognition of the right of women to an equal chance for the higher jobs, which

chance they do not have either in government or private business. This legislation decreeing that the married woman shall not be employed by the Government if her husband is also in the Government is nothing short of absurd and gives no consideration to the right of the individual to open competition on the basis of merits.

"Denial of employment to women on the ground of marriage is a penalty upon marriage and, therefore, opposed to sound public policy. The Indiana Supreme Court has held that marriage, as an institution, is protected, encouraged, and fostered by a sound public policy, and that an arbitrary determination that marriage of women teachers is good cause for removal is, as a matter of law, erroneous and invalid.

"As time passes, the absurdity and injustice of Section 213 of the Economy Act will become more and more apparent and enlightened sentiment will be so strong against such law that Congress will be forced to repeal it. We should not wait, however, for a revocation of the law which will come of itself as time passes, but should get busy and set into operation forces which will crystallize public disapproval and hasten the repeal movement.

"Every organization which has the welfare of women at heart should strike quickly at this unfair legislation, which, in the last analysis, is calculated to destroy existing opportunities and further restrict the chances which women have for advancement in the public service."

The chairman of the Government Workers' Council, Edwina Avery, presided for the event. Miss Dell was introduced by Sara P. Grogan.

A Working Woman in Massachusetts

By Josephine Casey

LAST spring while rather busy watching the legislatures of several States, I had a telephone message telling me that a hearing would be held on Senate Bill 357 at Boston.

Senate Bill 357 was an act to provide an enforcement for "the minimum wage law" by inserting three new sections.

Section 12-A read: "If the Commission shall at any time find that an employer is employing women or children or both in the manufacture of goods at a rate of compensation less than prescribed by

a decree of the commission as a minimum rate for such compensation, it shall order such employer to cause to be affixed to every article of goods, or to the package wherein it is marketed, a tag on which shall be plainly printed a recital that the goods are manufactured by women or children at a rate less than that prescribed by the commission."

Section 12-B read: "A dealer selling at retail within the Commonwealth goods

removed from a package tagged as aforesaid shall keep conspicuously posted on his premises a notice that goods are for sale on said premises manufactured in whole or in part by women or children at a rate less than that prescribed by the commission."

Section 12-C read: "Whoever knowingly and wilfully defaces, removes or destroys tag shall be subject to penalties prescribed in Section 12-A."

Marjorie Ann Gillis and I went to the hearing. We knew that the minimum wage

law if "for women" was a violation of our principle. The only employers present were those who favored the measure—the type that shed sweetness and compliments when it does not cost them anything. It was a master scene of fellowship to see the politicians praise the Consumers' League officers and the latter return the bows and the nice things the employers said. Well, I should have rejoiced at this, too, were it not that women—all the women in the world—were about to be handed a tag of inferiority. After they had finished, the chairman asked if there was any opposition. Thinking there was none, it was a shock to them when the field worker of the National Woman's Party stepped forward, saying, "I rise not only to defend woman, but to rescue you from a cream puff mess—you are so sticky with sweetness, you are absolutely gooey."

After the first shock, they came at me strong, but it did not bother me because

it was not a personal thing. I had parked the personal me outside. I was simply the mouth-piece for woman. These people would first humiliate woman by putting her with children in a minimum wage law and then practically agree that the law so-called could be broken, and a little tag would be given, and the retail store would put out a sign, and the result would be that every bargain hunter would swarm around that place like flies around honey, because they would know it had to be cheap. And how about all the packages put on trains or boats—those that are sent from New York and distributed from there—how were Section B and Section C to be enforced in regard to them? Would a retailer in Texas obey a legislative act made in Massachusetts? If the powerful manufacturers in New York can't trace "leakages," those bundles which are made up in hidden shops—if with all their wealth and trained machinery they can't find them, does any one suppose this silly label plan could do it?

While I was talking, an employer tried to ask a question direct but was prevented. He came to me later and said he saw the point, that I was right. While I was talking, a labor man came to Miss Gillis and told her I was right. When Marjorie Ann and I compared notes as we came out, I said, "Well, one employer and one labor leader saw the truth; I am confident others will see it." They must have, for Senate Bill 357 was sent back and forth until it expired with the adjournment of the legislature. They had done some thinking. When legislatures think about "persons," they think logically; but when it is "women" or "women and children," legislatures don't think, they just roam around in the thoughts of their grandfathers. It will be a perfect day when the amendment establishing equality in the law is passed, for then all of us, including those really worth-while legislators, will think in terms of human rights. Speed the day!

News from the Field

California Federation Endorses Equal Rights

ANNOUNCEMENT of the adoption of three resolutions with an Equal Rights bearing by the California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs at its recent annual convention, September 9 and 10, at Yosemite, California, was made in last week's issue of EQUAL RIGHTS. The texts of the resolutions with the names of the clubs which introduced them are as follows:

Presented by the Anaheim Club:

The Anaheim Business and Professional Women's Club endorses the following resolution for the consideration of the 1932 convention, California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.:

WHEREAS, there was introduced on January 11, 1932, in the House of Representatives of the United States a proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to wit: "Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction"; and

WHEREAS, there exists much ignorance as to why such an amendment is needed and much confused thinking relative to the effect that ratification of the amendment would have on existing States rights and protective labor laws for women only; and

WHEREAS, members of the federation should wish to take only enlightened action upon any subject of such tremendous importance to women:

Therefore, *Be It Resolved*, That this convention recommend to indi-

vidual clubs in the California Federation that each local program chairman bring to her club during the 1932-1933 season speakers qualified to discuss the subject entirely from the standpoint of facts; and

Be It Further Resolved, That this convention recommend to the State Legislative Chairman that she supply upon request of any federated member club such information and data on the subject as may be from time to time available.

Presented by the Business and Professional Women's Club of Los Angeles:

WHEREAS, the California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs has in successive conventions opposed legislation that placed restrictions upon women workers that did not apply to men; and

WHEREAS, the California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs believes that all legislation and restrictions, such as hours of work, and time and place of work, should be based upon the nature of the work and not upon the sex of the worker:

Now Therefore, Be It Resolved, That the California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs shall continue to oppose and urge its member clubs to continue to oppose all proposed legislation that applies only to women employed in gainful occupations, until such time as an amendment to the Constitution of California and an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

shall be proposed and be adopted that men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the State of California and the United States; and

Be It Further Resolved, That this Federation in convention assembled hereby endorse the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution of the United States now before the House of Representatives that "men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction"; and

Be It Further Resolved, That publicity be given this resolution through the press, radio, and all other possible mediums.

Endorsed by the Business and Professional Women's Club of Los Angeles.

JANE C. HUMPHREY,

President.

Presented by the Arcadia Club:

WHEREAS, there is now before Congress the question as to whether or not the United States is to join the World Court, and

WHEREAS, Senator Gerald P. Nye of North Dakota has introduced in the United States Senate what is known as the Equality Reservation Resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That in the event the United States adheres to the statute of the World Court it shall make the following reservation:

"That the code of law to be administered by the World Court shall not contain inequalities based on sex."

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved,

That in order to protect and maintain the present advance made in the United States toward equality of opportunity, the California Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, in thirteenth annual convention, endorse the foregoing Equality Reservation to the World Court, and

Further Be It Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Congressman from California, and

Further Be It Resolved, That publicity be given to this resolution through the press, radio and all other possible means.

ARCADIA BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUB,
ELVIRA ORSBURN, *President*.
MARGARET CULVER, *Secretary*.

A Noteworthy Anniversary

THE month just closed completed ten years of women's independence in citizenship; for on September 22, 1922, President Harding signed the Cable Act recognizing the independent nationality of married women.

Congressman John L. Cable, of the Fourth Ohio District, introduced the measure, and led the victorious fight for its adoption.

"Women of this country rejoice in the many benefits of the Cable Act," declared Anna Kelton Wiley of Washington, D. C., chairman of the National Council of the National Woman's Party, and widow of the late Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, father of the pure food law.

"Under a statute adopted in 1907 when American women had no political power, a woman by marrying a Canadian or any

other foreigner, was automatically deprived of her United States citizenship even though she continued to reside in this country. So far as a woman was concerned, citizenship was to be put on and to be put off like a garment. It depended not upon her will, but solely upon the status of her husband. That situation was changed by the Cable Act. Now a woman's citizenship, like a man's, is not affected by marriage," said Mrs. Wiley.

Olive Stott Gabriel of New York, president of the National Association of Women Lawyers, likewise extolled the benefits of the Cable Act. She said:

"The Cable Act is a great boon to women. Citizenship is a thing of the spirit, and the Cable Act recognizes and respects the love of women for their country. No man was ever robbed of the precious heritage of American citizenship because of his marriage to a foreigner, and the Cable Act ended the unjust rule of depriving a woman of the United States citizenship without her consent and solely because of marriage to an alien."

The Business and Professional Women's Clubs of California, through Una R. Winter of Upland, also praised the workings of the Cable Act. She said:

"Women throughout the United States are indebted to Congressman John L. Cable of Ohio for bringing to them the same nationality rights as are enjoyed by men. Today should be known as Cable Day!"

"Before the passage of the Cable Act serious consequences were often the result to an American woman of an international marriage. For instance, she might be deprived of her vote; might be deprived at home and abroad of the protection of her own government; might be sub-

jected even in her native land to the restrictions placed on aliens; might lose the right to engage in a learned profession, or to obtain paid employment; or to own or inherit real estate. Now that we have the Cable Act, women are treated as persons in their own right, and there exists a large measure of equality between men and women in the nationality laws."

Besides the groups mentioned above, other organizations which supported the Cable Act or the liberalizing Cable amendments to the Cable Act include the Business Women's Legislative Council of California, headed by Sue Brobst of Los Angeles; the National League of Women Voters; the General Federation of Women's Clubs; the National Business and Professional Women's Clubs; and the American Federation of Labor.

Cable Act Passed Ten Years Ago

BURNITA SHELTON MATTHEWS spoke over WRC on September 22 on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the passage of the Cable Act. Mrs. Matthews is Research Chairman of the National Woman's Party.

Feminists in Bicentennial Play

MEMBERS of the National Woman's Party are taking part in the first scene of the pageant, "The Vision of George Washington," written by Marie Moore Forrest, pageant director of the National Woman's Party, and now pageant director of the District Bicentennial Commission. The pageant will be given October 11, 12 and 13 at the Sylvan Theatre.

Those taking part are Mabel van Dyke, acting as supervisor of the scene, Angelina Carabelli, Fritz Firey, Irene Garretson, Florence Bond and Esther Cowan.

Press Comment

Many Are Hit By Marriage Ban

The Washington Times,
September 14, 1932.

persons, following the organization's statement that many married couples in the Federal service are planning separations to avoid the ban.

According to Miss Ruth Taunton, secretary of the Party, 50 married persons, most of them young, have come to her saying they intend to seek divorces because it is imperative that they keep their jobs.

Many employed girls plan to break their engagements, and other women will have to sacrifice their homes if either wage earner is removed under the Economy Act. She said:

"The National Woman's Party is inter-

THE National Woman's Party today is continuing its opposition to the Economy Act's discrimination against married

ested because we feel the law is striking primarily at married women. Several of the men interviewed declared that the choice between the wife and the husband leaving the Government service would be in favor of the female side of the twain, because the male would have a better chance of obtaining employment."

Woman Physician Wins High Award

The Daily Northwestern,
September 16, 1932.

given by the Wisconsin State Medical Society.

The award was presented last night. Dr. Glasier has been a physician for 50 years, is the wife, sister and niece of physicians. She is serving her eighth year with the State Board of Health and

MILWAUKEE—(U.P.) — Dr. Mina D. Glasier, Bloomington, today was the first woman physician to hold the council award

thirtieth year as secretary of the Grand County Medical Society. She is a past worthy grand matron of the Wisconsin Order of the Eastern Star and a former president of the Grant County Medical Society.

Oppose "Protective" Laws for Women

The Waupun Leader-News,
Waupun, Wis.,
September 12, 1932.

judge. The petitioners — Mayor W. A. Wagner of Waupun, Mayor George W. Watson of Fon du Lac, and Mayor Harold Bumby of Ripon—asked in the name of their communities and citizens that industries of the State be permitted to employ two 8-hour shifts of women and that

AN eleven and a half hour battle of words and figures was waged in the city auditorium Friday with the Industrial Commission of Wisconsin as referee and

the minimum wage rule be modified. These changes, they declared, would enable Wisconsin manufacturers to lower their costs enough to compete with manufacturers in unrestricted States, thus increasing and assuring employment for Wisconsin workers and the welfare of their communities. They were supported by many workers from Waupun, Beaver Dam, Fond du Lac, and other cities, numerous manufacturers, and the crowd was largely on their side. . . .

Equal Rights for men and women were supported by Mrs. Zona Gale Breese of Portage, noted author and wife of a Portage sock manufacturer.

"If men have a right to work nights, women should too, although I believe all hours should be shortened," she said. She testified that she had visited families near Waupun and found them unopposed to evening work. They were surprised at the question, and found the tragedy of work's removal the cause of distress.

Citing police court records of country women, which record the cause of evil as "I lost my job," she said that not long hours, lack of sunlight, or poor lighting is given as the cause, but loss of work.

That she was speaking for the change in hours and not the minimum wage law, Mrs. Breese made clear when she took the stand. By operating his mill three or four 9-hour days a week her husband is giving his employees work, while operating at a loss, she informed the commission. Her information that Mr. Breese has purchased 50,000 pounds of cotton to give his employees work brought cheers from Portage hosiery workers present.

"Fundamentally, the physical, mental, and moral welfare of women for this winter demands a job," she concluded.

Broken Homes Toll Of Economy Act

The Washington Herald,
Washington, D. C.,
September 14, 1932.

THE burning issue in the nation's Capital seems to be "will or will not the Government of the U. S. A. come out against love?"

The battle lines, as the phrase goes, were formed last night with Dan Cupid on one side and the Civil Service Commission on the other.

In between are the great mass of Government employes who are threatening a campaign of "depression divorces" to save their jobs. The field of strife is littered with broken engagements, discarded diamond solitaires and love letters wrapped in blue ribbon.

The whole trouble started with the economy law. That specified that when it becomes necessary to reduce Government personnel, the first to go shall be those who have wives or husbands also working in the Federal departments.

Several of the clerks thought they had

the solution. Wives and husbands would establish separate residences, and presto! they no longer would be technically married. Everybody would keep his job and the Civil Service Commission would have to find its economy elsewhere.

But the Civil Service Commission never knows when it's whipped. It came right back with a ruling that separate residences would not prevent the discharge of employees under the act. What's more, people who occupied separate residences, said the commission, were law evaders under the Economy Act.

Miss Ruth Taunton, secretary of the National Woman's Party, last night said:

"Here's what happened: At least 50 people have come in here seeking advice about what they should do. Most of them want to get a divorce. No hard feelings, you understand, but they would rather be divorced than lose their jobs. There are at least 20 women who plan to get a limited divorce which ought to get around the economy law.

"Most of the couples are young. The National Woman's Party is interested because we feel the law is striking primarily at married women. For instance, there were three men came in from the Navy Yard. They said they were mechanics and expect to be discharged.

"One of them said that in the choice between himself and his wife for dismissal, his wife will attempt to stay in the Government service, as he is better able to find employment in a private establishment. All three of the men already had established separate residences.

"There have been cases where girls said they would have to break their engagements because of the economy law. Also, others who would have to give up their homes if either wage earner is discharged."

New Angle On the "Two Jobs" Clause

Manitowic Herald-Times,
Manitowic, Wis.,
September 6, 1932.

BROKEN homes—separation of husbands and wives and in some cases divorce—are resulting, according to a Washington dispatch, from the

"married persons" clause of the Government's new Economy Act. The clause provides that married persons, living with a husband or wife also on the Government pay roll, shall be dismissed before other employees.

The departure to separate dwellings and the opening of divorce proceedings have taken place because the notices of discharge state that if the marital status of employees changes they may retain their jobs.

This is worth attention because the question of employing married women has arisen in city and State offices, schools and industries throughout the country.

It would seem to the impartial observer that, with jobs as scarce as they are, one each to any family is enough. The National Woman's Party, opposing the "married persons" clause, has collected facts showing another side of the picture.

Among the cases cited by this organization are a husband earning \$1,917 and a wife \$1,248, who contribute support to 14 people; another husband earning \$1,900 and wife earning \$1,640, who are buying a home they will lose if their income is reduced. Other instances of men and women working to support several dependents are quoted.

The situation appears to be another in which that which seems to be for the general good works hardship in individual cases. Perhaps a means can be devised to make exceptions when the need warrants. Breaking up of homes, often with children involved, can only lead to worse difficulties.

Here is one more indication that the ills of our complicated economic life today can not be cured by remedies effective twenty years ago.

Marriage Postponements Follow Job Losses

The Evening Star,
Washington, D. C.,
September 14, 1932.

ALTHOUGH refusing to divulge their identities, Ruth Taunton, secretary of the National Woman's Party, said today that one Washing-

ton couple already had filed suit for divorce so both the husband and wife may keep their jobs with the Government.

Miss Taunton said a number of other Federal workers have told her they intended to seek divorces unless there is a change in the recent ruling of the Civil Service Commission that maintenance of separate homes by husbands and wives, both employed by the Government, would be regarded as an attempt to evade the married persons' section of the Economy Act.

The section holds that in any necessary reduction of Government forces, the first to be dropped shall be men or women whose wives or husbands are also on the Federal pay roll.

Miss Taunton said that since the announcement of Government forces, the first Saturday, fifteen men and a score of women had come to the headquarters of the National Woman's Party and declared their intention to file for divorce. None of them, she said, was willing for his or her identity to be disclosed.

The majority of persons affected by the married persons' clause are between the ages of 30 and 40, Miss Taunton said, and entered the Government service here during the war. She said most of them are supporting children on their small salaries and that their economic security would be jeopardized if either husband or

wife should be thrown out of employment.

In a great many cases, she said, Government workers here are supporting relatives in the States. She cited the case of one couple who support their mothers, a war veteran, his wife and two children on their joint \$4,000 salary. Others, she said, have invested their savings in homes for years and will lose everything they have saved if one of the two jobs is lost.

In other cases, Miss Taunton said, young women and men have decided not to get married if their financial security is to be jeopardized by matrimony.

"It seems illogical," she said, "that these young people should be forced to abandon the friends they have made among their fellow-workers in their search for husbands or wives."

The National Woman's Party, through its Government Workers' Council, carried on a campaign to prevent women from losing their jobs under the act. The council discussions led to a consideration of the possibility of some sort of legal separation for the duration of the Economy Act, but this plan was subsequently dropped.

Divorce Actions Threatened

The Washington Daily News, Washington, D. C., September 13, 1932.

SUITS for divorce or legal separation are threatened as the result of the Civil Service Commission's ruling Saturday on the "married persons" provision of the Economy Law, it was declared today at headquarters of the National Woman's Party.

The commission held that mere maintenance of separate homes by wife and husband both in Federal employ would be regarded as an attempt to evade Section 213 of the Economy Act. That section provides, in any reduction of Government forces, the first to be dropped shall be men or women whose marital mates also are on the Federal pay roll.

Miss Ruth Taunton of the National Woman's Party said four men called at her office this morning with word that actual divorces will be sought. Three, she said, were Navy Yard mechanics who have received notice of impending dismissal, and the fourth was a policeman who said he expects to be discharged.

One of the Navy Yard employees was quoted as saying that if the choice is between himself and his wife for dismissal, his wife will attempt to stay in the Government service, as he is better able to find employment in a private establishment.

The four men, Miss Taunton said, previously had taken up separate living quarters, and had decided on divorces following the Civil Service ruling.

Court records this morning failed to show any increase in number of divorce

actions as the result of this situation, which has been brewing since July 1. On the contrary, court attaches said, divorce actions recently have shown a decrease, which is said to be due to the depression.

"It costs money to get divorces," they pointed out.

In the District the only ground for absolute divorce is misconduct, while drunkenness, desertion and cruelty (not necessarily physical) are grounds for limited divorces. In desertion cases, attorneys said, if the intent is final, the period of desertion does not matter.

Commenting on the possibility of divorces, Civil Service officials said informally today that even such actions might not be viewed as setting aside the Economy Act.

Woman Refused Admission To Stock Exchange

The Vote, London, England, September 2, 1932.

At a conference of women in Glasgow recently, speakers discussed the difficulties of the entrance of women to the Stock Exchange, and declared that "it was illogical to deny opportunities to the women of Great Britain," now that women of the United States, Norway, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Austria were admitted to Stock Exchange membership.

The Glasgow *Herald* reported Mr. Gifford, secretary of the Glasgow Stock Exchange, as denying the existence of any bar against women—"as far as the constitutional rules of the Stock Exchanges are concerned, there is no one which bars women from membership." A woman who applied, he said, would be treated just the same as a man. In Glasgow no woman had applied, and till she did the Stock Exchange was nominally open to them.

This sounds very satisfactory, but unfortunately facts do not square with it.

As our member, Miss Midgley, has found in Bradford, Stock Exchanges, though "nominally open," quickly shut up when a qualified woman approaches for admission. The "No Bar" condition described above may, says Miss Midgley, apply to Glasgow, but certainly not to Bradford.

It is now two and half years since she made her first effort to seek election to her local exchange, then consisting of sixteen members; two members promised to propose and second her nomination, but when she paid a personal visit to her nominator in order to obtain his signature, the question of sex was raised, which was the only "excuse" he could put forward for not fulfilling his promise, as she could easily fulfill all requirements which would be asked from a male applicant.

After her second effort, in January, 1931, the Bradford Stock Exchange passed a resolution that any application

by a woman should be refused; this surely constitutes a very formidable bar. All she asks is that she receive the same treatment as a male applicant and her case be considered solely on merit and not sex.

She has had over twenty-one years' experience.

Her character is beyond question and she can give the financial guarantee.

What more can be required?

STATEMENT OF THE OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT, CIRCULATION, ETC., REQUIRED BY THE ACT OF CONGRESS OF AUGUST 24, 1912.

Of *EQUAL RIGHTS*, published weekly at Baltimore, Md., October 1, 1932.
State of Maryland) ss.
City of Baltimore)

Before me, a Notary Public, in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Dora G. Ogle, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that she is the Business Manager of *EQUAL RIGHTS*, and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management (and if a daily paper, the circulation), etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in Section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, printed on the reverse of this form, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor, managing editor and business managers are:

Publisher, National Woman's Party, 144 B. Street N. E., Washington, D. C.

Editor, Edith Houghton Hooker, Upland, Roland Park, Md.

Managing Editor, Ruby A. Black, 144 B. St. N. E., Washington, D. C.

Business Manager, Dora G. Ogle, Catonsville, Md.

2. That the owner is: (If owned by a corporation, its name and address must be stated and also immediately thereunder the names and addresses of stockholders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of stock. If not owned by a corporation, the names and addresses of the individual owners must be given. If owned by a firm, company, or other unincorporated concern, its name and address, as well as those of each individual member, must be given.)

President, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.; Chairman National Council, Mrs. Harvey Wiley, D. C.; Vice-Chairmen, Gail Laughlin, Me.; Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.; Anita Pollitzer, S. C.; Secretary, Mrs. Dwight Clark, D. C.; Treasurer, Laura Berrien, D. C.; Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.; Director of National Activities, Muna Lee, Parliamentarian, Emma Fox, Mich.; Edith Ainge, N. Y.; Nina E. Allender, D. C.; Mrs. John W. Brannon, N. Y.; Mrs. Merritt O. Chance, D. C.; Mrs. Isaac H. Dixon, Md.; Bertha W. Fowler, Colo.; Elsie Hill, Conn.; Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.; Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.; Elizabeth T. Kent, Cal.; Ruth Vander Litt, N. Y.; Alma Lutz, N. Dak.; Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.; Dora G. Ogle, Md.; Alice Paul, N. J.; Sarah Pell, N. Y.; Elizabeth Seiden Rogers, N. Y.; Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.; A. Margaret Smith, Mass.; Doris Stevens, N. Y.; Mrs. John Jay White, N. Y.; Margaret Whittemore, Calif.; Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio; Maud Younger, Calif.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: (If there are none, so state.) There are none.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholder or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds or other securities than as so stated by her.

5. That the average number of copies of each issue of this publication sold or distributed, through the mails or otherwise, to paid subscribers during the six months preceding the date shown above is: (This information is required from daily publications only.)

DORA G. OGLE,
Business Manager.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 24th day of September, 1932.

ANNE R. HEYMAN, N. P.

(My commission expires May 1, 1933.)

DAY PRINTING COMPANY

PUBLICATIONS AND BOOKS

600 East Lombard Street
Baltimore, Md.